DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 663 UD 020 017

AUTHOR Hunt, Neen, Ed.: Holt, Ben, Ed.
TITLE The Dropout Report: Number of Dropouts, Current Responses, Recommendations.
INSTITUTION New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 16 Oct 79
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; *Dropouts; *Educational Policy; Failure Factors; *School Responsibility; Secondary Education; *Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Despite the difficulty inherent in counting dropouts, it can be estimated that about 45 percent of the ninth graders in New York City public high schools drop out before completing their high school education. These dropouts, characteristically, have experienced academic failure and will probably continue to experience failure after they leave school. Several studies help to explain why students drop out. Reasons include academic failure, boredom, alienation or lack of motivation, personal or home problems, and language difficulties. The school system itself also contributes to the problem by not responding adequately to the vulnerable student. Some programs do exist for preventing students from leaving school and assisting dropouts to return. There is a need for more of these programs in the lower grades, however, and for more extensive services in the high schools. The Chancellor's attendance and promotional policies, the High School Division outreach policy, a Board-wide task force on Regents Competency Tests, and a new high school admissions policy are changes which should be able to reduce the dropout rate. In addition, a number of new programs that would help to identify future dropouts and bring past dropouts back into the educational system could be immediately implemented.
(Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179663

DEC 3 - 1979

THE DROPOUT REPORT

- NUMBER OF DROPOUTS
- CURRENT RESPONSES
- RECOMMENDATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD020017

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Edmonds
NYC Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 16, 1979

New York City Public Schools
Frank J. Macchiarola, Chancellor

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

FRANK J. MACCHIAROLA
CHANCELLOR

October 16, 1979

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Members of the Board of Education

FROM: Frank J. Macchiarola
Chancellor

RE: The Dropout Report

* *

This report is the first attempt in recent years by staff of the central administration of the New York City public schools to identify the scope of the dropout problem our schools are experiencing. In the past, internal differences in record-keeping, definition and basic data have been cited as obstacles in measuring the number of dropouts.

Thus, we have unfortunately often left it to others to tell us how bad the problem is, but then have disputed the accuracy of those claims without offering a measure of our own. This has clearly left an impression of either unawareness or lack of concern on our part, and may well have hampered our effectiveness in mounting appropriate actions to address the problem.

This report, produced with the cooperation of various offices and divisions, represents our accord about the dimension and seriousness of the problem, as well as a commitment to confront it together. It confirms that about 45% of the entering 9th graders never complete a high school education. There is no question that our responsibilities to these young people have been grievously unfulfilled.

Because our school system, the largest in the nation, is only now developing the capacity to record centrally the course of individual students through their school careers, it is still difficult to specify precisely how many students leave our system. The report does present reasonable estimates within the limitations of the definition of the term "dropout" which are employed and the best data currently available to us. Likewise, it is still difficult to determine exactly how many of our students who do leave school return to some educational program at some time. The report estimates that while some do, most, probably, do not.

However, we must not overly dwell on the technical difficulties inherent in any discussion of the dropout problem; rather we must concentrate our discussion on how our school system can successfully address the needs of a vast percentage of its students whom it is currently not adequately serving.

The reasons that students drop out of school are complicated, and this report only begins to attempt to present answers. The constellation of causes includes alienation, history of failure, emotional and physical problems and language skill deficiencies. It is our responsibility to understand better the causes and more aggressively develop and apply methods of ameliorating them.

This report offers hope and promise that this can be done. We are not beginning from a position of ignorance. Throughout our school system, on all levels, there are teachers, counselors, administrators and other staff who, with compassion, knowledge, skill and commitment, are directly and successfully helping students complete their education, that is, students who otherwise would leave school.

The philosophy of this administration is based on these positive examples. All staff, administrators, parents, community members and students must take notice that we can and must educate all of our students. Policies are described in the report which reflect this philosophy. Currently, some are being developed and some are being implemented in the areas of promotions, high school admissions, outreach to dropout, attendance and student preparation for competency standards. More must be done more quickly.

Much can be done within the existent high school budget. Yet, to accomplish significantly more would require additional funding. The money can only become available if there is widespread awareness that we do have the ability and will to educate all of our students and we demonstrate that we are making progress.

The recommendations at the end of this report are practical, and they can be implemented. I am directing the Executive Director of High Schools and other key personnel in the central administration to amplify the recommendations and to prepare a detailed three-year plan which will account for the following goals:

-- A specified number of dropouts must be returned to high school each year;

-- A specified percentage of the dropout rate must be reduced each year; and,

-- A specified percentage of students served by dropout prevention and treatment programs must be increased each year.

THE DROPOUT REPORT

Number of Dropouts

Current Responses

Recommendations

Prepared by High School Division
Nathan Quinones, Executive Director

Under the Direction of Thomas Gross, Director of Management,
High School Division

Acknowledgements

Editor: Neen Hunt, Coordinator, High School Development,
Office of Educational Evaluation

Marc Bassin, Director, Planning and Project Management
Alan Blumner, Acting Director, Office of Educational Evaluation
Irving Berchuck, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Pupil Personnel Services
Carol Brownell, Executive Director, Division of Public Affairs
Mary Cohn, Consultant, Coordinator of High School Articulation Study, Office of Educational Evaluation
Malvin J. Cutler, Deputy Executive Director, Division of High Schools
Ron Edmonds, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction
Ralph Edwards, Deputy Director, Bureau of Attendance and Safety
Ben Holt, Education Administrator, Office of Planning and Evaluation
Pat Jordon, Assistant to the Deputy Chancellor
Louise Latty, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Community School District Affairs
James Lee, Education Administrator, Office of Planning and Evaulation
Joan Salzburg, Director of Publication, Division of Public Affairs
Jody Spiro, Consultant, Planning and Project Management
Charles Troob, Coordinator, Data Analysis Unit, Office of Educational Evaluation
Tim Wendt, Assistant to the Deputy Chancellor

SPECIAL THANKS

This report represents a cooperative effort among many individuals from various offices and divisions of the Board of Education. We are especially indebted to several individuals for their considerable contributions within a relatively short period of time.

Charles Troob and Tim Wendt carefully researched the quantitative analysis which required extensive exploration and study. Neen Hunt provided overall editorial assistance. Ben Holt edited the final manuscript, and Bea Lospinuso, Millie Grillo and Karen Almodovar typed and re-typed the manuscript cheerfully and carefully.

THOMAS GROSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.	1
How Many Dropouts Are There?.	3
Why Students Dropout of School.	9
How Is the School System Responding to Dropouts and Potential Dropouts? Programs and Policies . .	14
High School Programs.	18
Community School District Programs.	21
Programs in Special Education	22
School System Policies.	23
Recommendations	30
Programmatic Recommendations.	31
Administrative Recommendations.	36
Footnotes	i
Appendix A	iv

INTRODUCTION

About 45% of the students of the New York City public high schools drop out before completing their high school education.[1] While some do return to school eventually, only a negligible number receive a high school diploma. This means that each year approximately more than 40,000 students drop out of high school.

These dropouts, characteristically, have experienced considerable academic failure during their school careers and probably will continue to experience failure after they leave school. They have a high probability of falling into the category of the "hard core unemployed" who are shunned by government job programs and businesses because they lack the cognitive and personal skills for entry level job training.[2] To survive, the dropout must often turn to welfare, crime or "hustling" on the street.

The dropout rate would be even higher were it not for a wide variety of programs in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Many effective efforts are being made to prevent students from dropping out, to return dropouts to school, and to provide an education to the dropouts who do return to school. These efforts are simply too limited compared with the number of young people in need.

HOW MANY DROPOUTS ARE THERE?

It is quite difficult -- more difficult than one would guess -- to determine the number of students who drop out of school during any period of time. Because of compulsory attendance laws, students must be enrolled in school at least until age 16, when they may leave to take full-time employment. Without "working papers" a student must remain enrolled until age 17, with a few minor exceptions. Officially a student is a truant, not a dropout, until legally discharged. Moreover, students below the age of 17 frequently "drop out" gradually, becoming increasingly truant, but continue to "drop into school" from time to time for a variety of reasons. We cannot identify a date at which these students change from "students attending school" to "students who have dropped out of school."

In order to enumerate dropouts, we must therefore rely on indirect methods. This report uses two methods, which are based on different definitions of dropout, and which use different data. Not surprisingly, they produce somewhat different results as well. However, both results are consistent with the opening statement, that about 45% of our students drop out before completing high school.

The first of the definitions of "dropout" used in this report is "an incoming ninth grade student who does not successfully complete high school and does not receive either a diploma or a certificate. (As of June, 1979 the Board of Regents has only authorized the issuance of diplomas and not certificates). This definition can be applied to existing data to obtain a reasonable estimate of the percentage of dropouts for a

single graduating class. The estimate cannot be precise because of the manner in which the school system currently assembles the pertinent data; the careers of individual students are not followed and enumerated.

Considering the graduating class of June, 1978 (in combination with the graduating class of January, 1979), according to this definition, the percentage of dropouts is computed in the following way: the total number of incoming ninth grade students in September, 1974 was 85,459; the number of students awarded diplomas or certificates in June, 1978 and January, 1979 totalled only 48,173, 56.4% of the number who entered ninth grade four years previously. This suggests a dropout rate of close to 44% for the Class of 1978. (See Table I.).

Table I

Estimating the Rate of Non-Completion for the Class of 1978[3]

Students entering Grade 9, September, 1974			Students graduating June, 1978-January 1979	
From public schools		73,063	June, 1978	40,586
Grade 8	69,075		January, 1979	7,587
7 SP	3,891			48,173
Others	97			
From non-public schools (estimated)		12,396		
Total		85,459		

Estimated non-completers: 85,459 - 48,173 = 37,286

Estimated non-completion rate: 37,286/85,459 = 43.6%

Source: Promotion--Office of Educational Statistics; Graduates--Division of H.S.

This rate may be taken as indicative of the recent dropout rate of the New York City public high schools, as the numbers used in the calculations vary little from year to year. It is important to recognize, however, that a high school class is not composed of a fixed group of students. In a four-year period many students move into the city, a large percentage of them from foreign countries. Many others move out. Students fail courses and are held over into the next class. Students from previous classes are held over into the class of current interest. Without a data system that has access to individual pupil records, we cannot trace out the history of the precise group of students who entered ninth grade in September, 1974. (A forthcoming student data base should make possible this kind of analysis.) We can say that in-migration approximately balances out-migration, and that from year to year the holdover rate is relatively constant.[4] Thus, for the Class of 1978 it is valid to estimate dropouts from grades 9-12 by subtracting the number of graduates from the number of entering ninth graders. The result will understate the true dropout problem, because the method does not consider the students who never reach ninth grade.[5]

The second definition of "dropout" is employed by the Bureau of Attendance. This definition includes four categories of students officially discharged: a) students over 17 and discharged with parental consent; b) students age 16 or 17 with full-time employment certificates; c) students reported truant and not found by the Bureau of Attendance after investigation; d) students who request discharge on the basis of marriage. Because some discharged students re-enter high

school, and some of the "not found" students may actually be in school, the discharge figures probably overestimate the number of students who are permanently separated from the school system.

Table II presents a recent estimate of the number of students discharged from the high schools in each of these "dropout" categories. The Bureau of Attendance, which assembled the data, cautions that they should be regarded as approximate, because of known errors in pupil accounting, coding, and tabulation.

Table II

Students Discharged from New York City High Schools, 1978
(tabulated for four categories of discharge)

	Over 17	Employment Certificate	Not Found	Married	Total
Number of Students	40,354	1,343	3,238	108	45,043
Percentage of Total	89.6	3.0	7.2	0.2	100.0

The 45,000 "dropout" discharges are 14.4% of the total high school register (313,468 on October 31, 1977). Simple algebraic calculations show that if a class were to lose 14.4% of its students each year, then in four years it would lose about 46% of its students.[6] Thus the discharge data are roughly consistent with the previous calculation of dropout rates.

These figures do not account for two other educational alternatives open to our high schools students: Evening High Schools and Auxiliary Services Centers. In the Evening High Schools in 1978-1979 the total enrollment was 33,000. Of this total, approximately 13,000 were dropouts who returned and 20,000 were day high school students who were completing course requirements. Among the former dropouts, only 349 received high school diplomas. It is difficult to compute the dropout rate of the population of dropouts in Evening High School, given the data collection methodologies which are employed; however, optimistially, it appears to be 80%. That is, of the total 13,000 former dropouts in Evening High Schools during 1978-1979, probably more than 10,000 will never receive a diploma and perhaps 3,000 eventually will, over several years.

In the Auxiliary Service Centers in 1978-1979 there were 12,432 former dropouts enrolled and 2,376 students received General Equivalency Diplomas (GED's). The GED is accepted by the City University Of New York, most community colleges, some branches of the military for limited job classifications and by some businesses for entry level training.

For the purpose of this study, the total number of students who receive a diploma in a particular year will not be augnmented by the total number of GED's issued. Thus, even when taking into consideration the return of dropouts in some kind of school, the dropout rate in the New York City Schools still remains about 45%.

WHY STUDENTS DROP OUT OF SCHOOL

There is no rigorous answer to the question of why students drop out of New York City Public Schools. Yet, several recent studies conducted by the school system are helpful in providing tentative answers. The first, conducted by the Office of Educational Evaluation, was a study of the dropout problem designed to identify the major causes of dropping out of school, and ways the school system can effectively respond to the problem. It was based on in-depth interviews (2½ hours) with 98 staff members (administrators, teachers, counselors) in local high schools, alternative high schools, and Auxiliary Services, 76 students in drop-out prevention programs, 31 students who dropped out and then returned to school, and 24 non-returning dropouts. This study of dropouts, called Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out, reveals that students drop out for a variety of reasons which include among others 1) academic failure 2) boredom or lack of motivation 3) feelings of alienation 4) personal or home problems 5) behavior problems and 6) language difficulties. Findings from the study also suggest that the school system itself contributes to the dropout problem by not making enough efforts to respond to the student who is vulnerable to dropping out. For example, respondents largely agree that the academic-comprehensive high school offerings and instructional approaches do not meet the needs of low achievers. Also, they mention that often staff members aren't doing enough to reach out to the dropout prone student. They explain that some staff

members aren't aware of these students' problems, while others are too busy attending to the students whom they see as most likely to succeed in school. Interestingly, most respondents felt that dropout prone students could do well in school if their problems were given more personal attention, if the instructional program accounted for their learning needs and learning styles, and if their pattern of failure could be stopped at an early age.

This last point finds supporting evidence in a second study, conducted by the High School Division. The Retention Study provided a quantative analysis of a random sample of 140 ninth grade students in a Title I high school and examined factors related to a comparison of students who were retained and students who were discharged. The study found that the origin of the tendency to drop out of high school may be directly traced to the years preceding high school. It concluded that the older the student upon entry into high school, or the less equipped with cognitive skills, the less chance of retention. Specifically, the study found that almost 100% of the students who were below grade level on standardized math and reading tests, by a combined total of more than seven years, dropped out of school. The study does not argue that academic failure causes dropping out but only that it correlates with dropping out.

Another study, the High School Articulation Report, conducted by the Office of Educational Evaluation, adds another dimension to an understanding of how the school system inadvertently contributes to the dropout problem. While it is not a quantitative study of

dropout rates, but rather an attitudinal study, it does suggest that the complexity of the high school admissions process itself sometimes aggravates students' negative attitudes toward school and lends to their dropping out, especially for low achievers and others who are already dropout prone. This particular interpretation seems to be supported by a study conducted by the Center for Career and Occupational Education.[7] This study found that applicants who are not admitted to educational options and vocational-technical schools are more likely to drop out than those who never applied.

The Articulation Study also points out that students sent to schools far from their homes sometimes experience strong feelings of alienation toward the receiving school. For students who have been on the verge of dropping out, this experience reinforces their negative attitudes.

The question of why students drop out of school is complicated and beyond our current ability to answer satisfactorily. We do infer from the data another reason, however, the awareness and commitment

does not yet exist among sufficient numbers of administrators and staff that the school system can and should address the educational needs of potential dropouts and actual dropouts who are of school age. The result is an implicit triage system. Staff and administrators tend to put their energies in the direction of helping students who have a reasonable chance of "making it".

There are several illustrations of the implicit triage system. Many dropout prevention programs have established requirements so that students with the highest probability of success are admitted. One example comes from an analysis of a sample of twenty-two mainstream high school prevention programs provided by the study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out: students with below a sixth grade reading level, students who haven't spent at least one year in the high school, or students younger than sixteen years of age are ineligible. That is, students with a history of prolonged failure and excessive absenteeism rarely make it into the very programs which they need most. Several alternative schools also use the implicit triage system of admission. For example, five of the schools have minimum age requirements or academic pre-requisites, one requires the attendance of a parent or guardian at orientation sessions before the student can be admitted, and three of the eleven alternative schools have residency requirements. Some principals also have manifested a triage approach to daily attendance policies. Until the Chancellor prohibited the practice, some principals had a "lock-out" policy, prohibiting the entrance of students who arrived to school late so as to preserve order for those who arrived on time.

Given the scarce resources of the school system it is understandable that this "triage psychology" has evolved. The question raised by this report is how the needs of the students who are currently in peril of dropping out can be better addressed without damaging the education of the students who currently have a reasonable chance of succeeding.

HOW IS THE SCHOOL SYSTEM RESPONDING TO DROPOUTS AND POTENTIAL DROPOUTS? PROGRAMS AND POLICIES.

Some programs do currently exist on all levels of the school system (K-12) which are effectively preventing students from leaving school and assisting dropouts to return to school. Were it not for these programs and the caring, skilled adults who staff them, many more youngsters would have abandoned their education. Supporting evidence for this conclusion appears in the dropout study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out, which reports that an overwhelming majority of the students from the interview sample who were enrolled in fifty-three (53) prevention programs and schools said they would have dropped out if it weren't for these special settings.

Programs and schools that are effective with potential or actual dropouts share a constellation of features. According to the study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out, these include the following:

1. Caring, skilled counselors, teachers and administrators who believe that their students can learn.

2. A commitment from the school leadership that dropout prevention is a priority.

3. An instructional program individually tailored to the learning needs and styles of different students and advancing hierarchically through a sequence of skills.

4. Course offerings that are future goal oriented and that make sense to students in terms of their personal experiences.

5. Learning goals that can be achieved at the student's own pace in period of time generally less than three weeks.

6. Job experiences.

7. A grading system that builds in success by connecting it to learning tasks set in accordance with students' achievement levels.

8. Immediate feedback on performance.

9. Professional counseling supplemented by peer counseling.

10. Career information that leads to job placement.

11. Emphasis on reading improvement and the practical application of mathematics.

12. A system of discipline that establishes a bottom line for unacceptable behavior, with a minimum of rules, with clear penalties consistently enforced; rewards for observing rules and flexibility for students with special circumstances must be part of the system.

These programs also share limitations: they have difficulty in assisting the disruptive student, the student with severe personal/emotional problems and the student three to four years or more below grade level in academic skills.

The New York City Public School System has been working with different kinds of prevention programs for decades. These years of experimenting have sharpened educators' understandings about how to implement program components successfully. One insight has been that the task of individualizing learning must be based on careful diagnosis and prescription, i.e., testing for specific skills, instructional tasks aimed at teaching those skills, frequent re-testing and ongoing feedback to the student. Another is that highly structured teaching lessons must address the affective domain, as well as skill development. (A positive example of this approach is provided by the High School Division's Personal Growth Laboratory in the

Cooperative Education Job Program.)

All proponents of dropout prevention stress the importance of early detection of the dropout prone student and swift treatment of the student's problems. The older the student with school-related problems, the less chance of his/her success in school. The Retention Study of the High School Division further illustrates this point by quantitatively documenting the dropout dynamic. The study reports that dropouts have a history of failure in subject classes, academic skills several years below grade level, a high absence rate (students "drift" from truancy to dropping out), and are likely to be older than their classmates because they have been left back. The results of The Retention Study underscore that early identification of potential dropouts is possible and imperative.

It must be repeated that although much is known about how to decrease the dropout rate substantially in the school system, the response to the problem has been limited. Prevention programs appear to be in greatest number at the high school level, and yet, they are even more needed on the lower grade levels; the signs of students vulnerable to dropping out are apparent, and yet, the system's resources and methods for detection and diagnosis are minimal; and there is consensus among educators about the ingredients for program success with potential dropouts, and yet, many programs are implemented without these essentials.

In the description which follows, programs on the high school level, programs on the community district level, programs in special edu-

cation, and finally, policies which have been or are being initiated by the Board of Education which positively address the causes of students dropping out of school will be presented.

The study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Dropout, reveals that the majority of the high schools have developed some programs to counteract dropping out. Among 95 of the mainstream high schools which were surveyed for approaches specifically designed to affect the dropout rate, 84 reported some approach. The approaches vary tremendously in terms of purpose, methodology and scope. A categorization of the different approaches reveals the following:

Forty (40) of the ninety-five (95) schools have supportive services for dropout prone students. Mainly, these consist of special guidance and counseling programs such as peer counseling, group counseling and systematic liaison with other city agencies that help students cope with personal and family problems.

Twenty-four (24) of the schools have work-related programs for potential dropouts such as classes in career awareness, on-the-job training arrangements with hospitals, businesses and industries and job placement for students who want or need part-time work.

Fourteen (14) of the schools offer dropout prone students preparation for the general equivalency examination.

Thirty (30) of the schools have mini-schools which offer students in risk of dropping out an instructional program more flexible than that of the mainstream. The mini-schools differ in several respects. Some are off-site, some within the local school building; some graduate their students, while others prepare students for a return to the main high school; and some have as few as twenty-five (25)

students, while others have as many as one hundred or more students (100).

Twelve (12) of the schools report special attention to issues of attendance: cutting, lateness, excessive absenteeism. These efforts take the form of re-entry classes to help the long-term absentee gradually adjust to the demands of the school setting, attendance awards programs, support personnel specially trained to communicate with parents of truants, street workers assigned to follow-up poor attenders (i.e., go to their homes, find out the source of the problem, track down the truant who isn't at home).

In addition to the programs within the local high schools, the dropout prone student may find special assistance within any of the ten (10) city-wide independent alternative high schools. Most of these schools are committed ideologically to working with students who, for whatever the reasons, are not succeeding in the mainstream. The total enrollment in the alternative schools is 11,083. The actual dropout may enroll in a school within the Division of Auxiliary Services and obtain a General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.) or he may enroll in any of the five (5) Academic Evening High Schools and obtain an academic high school diploma.

In spite of the seeming plethora of programs and schools which apply effective practice and significantly assist potential and actual dropouts, apparently there are many more dropout prone students than the existing programs and services can handle practically. According to staff members interviewed for the study, Interrupted

Education: Students Who Drop Out, there is a demand that is not being met: many potential dropouts do want an education. Auxiliary Services report that it has a waiting list of 4,000 students but lacks staff and space to accommodate them; some alternative schools also report long waiting lists, as well; only about thirty (30) mainstream high schools have mini-schools for potential dropouts, and they claim they could be serving more students with added resources.

The lack of availability of programs for students in need is aggravated by the apparent tendency of dropout prevention and treatment programs to be short-lived. The study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out, points to a variety of their problems. These include short-term funding, inadequate funding for a small staff/student ratio, and the lack of commitment of their principals. Interestingly, a study of schools-within-schools indicate yet another potential problem: staff members can "burn-out". Since working in programs for potential dropouts is so demanding on their time and emotions, staff members, themselves, drop out of the programs after one or two years, in spite of their initial ideological commitment to working with troubled youths.[8]

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRAMS

The vast majority of Community Districts have instituted dropout prevention and treatment programs. From a survey (see Appendix A) of these efforts provided by the Office of Community School District Affairs it appears that most efforts consist primarily of additional support services for students with attendance, discipline or achievement difficulties. These take the form of personal counseling for students and their parents, remediation in classes with small student-staff ratios, alcohol and drug education programs, and in some cases, community workers who follow-up with visits to homes of students in need of special assistance. In addition, some community school districts offer programs which are alternatives to the mainstream. As alternatives, they provide students with career exploration, group and family counseling, and a special academic program of instruction. District 19, in particular, is in the process of establishing a prep school for potential dropouts as a bridge program for students going from the junior high into high school, a transition point which often leads to a high dropout rate. (The latter point is documented in the Articulation Study). Some Districts have arrangements with different privately funded programs that work with potential dropouts. Examples of these include the Rheedlen and DOME Programs.[9] The inference that may be drawn from the survey

is that most Districts have begun to develop dropout prevention and treatment programs but only a small percentage of the students in need are being reached.

PROGRAMS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

A Junior High School Retrieval and Redirection Program which has been recognized as an exemplary program by Title IV-c of the State Education Department, provides counseling and job placement for mildly retarded adolescents. This program was developed after research indicated that a 41% dropout rate of these students has existed.

In addition, a High School Retrieval and Redirection Program has also been developed. It has similar goals as the Junior High Program but serves mentally retarded young adults, ages 17-21. The population consists of dropouts, no-shows, chronic truants and students with erratic attendance.

Since no other programs offer these unique services for this population, requests are made by referring agencies for High School Retrieval and Redirection to serve special education youngsters even of other handicaps.

SCHOOL SYSTEM POLICIES

I. The Chancellor's Attendance Policy.

Many dropouts, studies suggest, exhibit poor or erratic attendance as early as the elementary school years. This pattern usually leads to skill retardation, which in turn insures continued failure, which almost inevitably leads the student to feel frustrated, to reject school, and to drop out. In light of this evidence, the New York City Public Schools face one of its most challenging problems: the high rate of daily pupil absenteeism. In a representative month of worst attendance, February, 1977, the average number of daily absentees was 199,906; in a month of best attendance, April, 1978, the average number of daily absentees was 142,527.

To respond to the attendance problem, the Bureau of Attendance has formulated a new comprehensive plan for improving attendance in the New York City Schools. The objectives of this plan are to:

A.) increase attendance in district schools by at least 1% above the 1978-79 results.

B.) increase attendance in high schools by at least 2% above 1978-79.

C.) increase attendance in special education by at least 7% above 1978-79.

These objectives will be achieved by a comprehensive plan of action. In brief summary, the plan includes the following steps:

1.) Improving the management practices of the Bureau of

Attendance, initiating in-service training for attendance teachers, and implementing an individual performance planning system.

2.) Creating an Attendance Task Force consisting of attendance supervisors and assistant principals. The Task Force came into being in 1978-79 and currently evaluates school attendance plans through auditing of individual school attendance data and clearing of school registers; it monitors the enforcement of Attendance and Public Health laws by the Court Units; and it improves communication to students and parents, including the updating of the Attendance Manual; it will improve data management by the computerization of pupil accounting and attendance reporting by 1980-81. To date, the Task Force has been in all community school districts, but not in the high schools.

3.) Improving the linkage among high schools, community school districts and community organizations that provide follow-up services to long-term absentees (e.g. The Rheedlen Program and the Student Action Strategy). Toward this end a city-wide attendance conference is being planned.

4.) Instituting more services aimed at the early identification and treatment of chronic absentees in the elementary and junior high schools.

5.) Providing incentives to pupils for improvement of attendance problems in each school through rewards programs.

6.) Increasing the number of Special Services Units (SSU) to identify and place children found in public places during school hours.

7.) Implementing a process for screening caseloads of attendance teachers for possible preparation of Family Court Petitions in those cases where it appears that the negligence of the parents is contributing to the student's absence from school.

II. High School Division Outreach Policy.

For the first time in the history of the high schools, this year each high school receives an allocation of .003 units[10] per long term absentee for the purpose of hiring paraprofessionals or school neighborhood workers to contact and return dropouts to school. For the first time the High School Division is making a financial commitment to support its philosophical commitment to providing an education for all high school age students. In addition, each school is required to develop plans to implement dropout prevention and treatment programs where none currently exist or augment existing programs for the Spring Term, 1980.

Additionally, Auxiliary Services for High Schools is launching Operation FARCRY (Follow-up and Retrieval City-Wide Reclamation of Youth). FARCRY is a program to provide all students who have dropped out with an opportunity to obtain a High School Equivalency Diploma. It is expected that the local high schools will participate in the FARCRY effort by making referrals to Auxiliary Services to students who do not wish to remain in their high schools. Exit Interview Cards and retrieval rosters have been implemented to facilitate referrals.

III. The Chancellor's Promotional Policy.

While the causes of dropping out vary, all studies point to academic failure as primary. Staff members interviewed in the study, Interrupted Education: Students Who Drop Out, attribute the academic failure of their students, in part, to the school system's current practice of social promotion. Characterizing many high school dropouts as students with third and fourth grade reading levels, few study skills, and poor self-image in terms of academic potential, they blame dropping out on years of failure and frustration which these students have experienced in the classroom.

The Chancellor will shortly propose a response to this aspect of the dropout problem with a new promotional policy to take effect in 1980. It would establish Minimum Performance Standards in grades K-9, specifying what school skills students must learn in order to proceed to the next level. Also under consideration is a focused intervention on specific grades which would limit promotion until prescribed levels of competency were attained.

IV. The Chancellor's Board-Wide Task Force on Regents Competency Tests

Another major response to the lack of achievement of many students who continue to be promoted is the implementation of the State's Regents Competency Tests, the passing of which is a requirement for high school graduation. The State is also requiring that 85% of the students in a school pass the tests if the school is to be re-registered by the State. Although these standards will help demonstrate students' skill

levels and be useful for developing programs and curricula to help students develop competency, one unintended outcome could likely be an increase in the number of dropouts. Students who are pessimistic about passing a competency test might choose to leave school for fear of failure and those who fail might leave out of discouragement.

To diminish the likelihood of these possibilities, a Board-Wide RCT Task Force has been formed whose mandate is to develop a comprehensive plan to prepare students for the RCTs. The different aspects of the plan include the development of writing and mathematics curricula, teacher training, articulation with feeder schools, data management and guidance services directed at helping students understand the significance of the tests. Progress to date has been made on several projects. The writing curriculum has been developed for English courses and is being implemented this term with special attention being paid to the seniors who are in danger of not being graduated because of the competency test requirement in writing for 1980. Preliminary workshops were held for all subject area assistant principals in teaching writing, and a schedule of follow-up workshops has been planned and distributed. English assistant principals have already participated in a workshop in which they were given test results from their school instruction in the interpretation of competency test score data for program and curriculum development.

Guidance procedures have been instituted to inform all students and their parents of the students' graduation requirement status. And, a handbook for students is currently being prepared which describes the competency requirements.

V. High School Admissions Policy.

The High School Division is committed to improving the access of all students to programs which meet their needs and their choices. Toward this goal, it has initiated a thorough analysis of the high school application process. To remedy some of the unintended inequitable consequences of the high school admissions process, the following considerations are under discussion: developing identifiable career and vocational options in most schools; creating clusters of schools within a borough providing a range of options; identifying borough-wide options; identifying city-wide options; having students apply for programs rather than schools. The net effect of these considerations will be the strengthening of the local zoned school so that it becomes more attractive to students of all ability levels.

To further facilitate making the admissions process more equitable a strategy being carefully examined is the development of a computerized, centralized admissions system for all high schools. The first step in this direction is being taken this year with the computerization of applications for vocational education schools (unscreened). The computerized system would enable the high schools to simplify the application process, provide a single application, establish eligibility standards, eliminate rolling rejections and

provide uniform test criteria for screened programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the school system is addressing the dropout problem in many ways, much more must be done in order to lower significantly the dropout rate and provide a quality education for this large group of students who are fleeing our schools. The following recommendations are practical and in most cases specific and readily lend themselves to implementation. They fall into two broad categories: programs for actual and potential dropouts and administrative actions which will encourage students to stay in school.

PROGRAMMATIC RECOMMENDATIONS

I. "Dropouts Can Learn"

Purposes: The development of a substantial program to alert all constituencies to the tragically large number of dropouts, and to the successful and effective practices already know about how to educate dropout students.

A. Mandate that exit interview procedures for students who are being discharged include counseling and communication of information explaining alternatives and procedures for returning to school if the dropout student chooses to do so.

An Exit Interview Manual will be developed which contains the appropriate information.

Implementation: Spring 1980

Responsibility: Community District Superintendents and the Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

B. Disseminate information on effective dropout prevention and treatment programs to supervisors and staff of all levels of the school system, with particular emphasis on principals through conferences, workshops and on-site visitations. Too many of our professionals do not believe that dropouts can and want to learn due to the "triage psychology" explained in the text.

This program should counter that psychology.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Assistant Superintendent for Community District Affairs, Community District Superintendents and the Executive Director of High Schools, Executive Director, Division of Public Affairs, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

C. Present conferences for parents of potential and actual dropouts to communicate information on the kinds of assistance that exist for their children within the school system and within community agencies and to communicate that their intervention is necessary in assisting their children to return to school.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Assistant Superintendent for Community District Affairs and Community District Superintendents, Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

II. Program Development

Purpose: Significant expansion of dropout prevention and treatment programs on all levels of the school system. All programs must be based upon what experience and research show works with potential and actual dropouts: individualized attention to learning needs and emotional needs in order to motivate the students. That is, diagnosis and prescription must be central to theseprograms. Furthermore, the programs should reflect the other dimensions of effective practices documented in this Report in the section entitled "...Programs and Policies"

A. Target priority schools for program development through selection of schools with high dropout rates, low attendance rates and low achievement scores.

Implementation: December 1979

Responsibility: Director, Office of Educational Evaluation Assistant Superintendent for Community District Affairs, Community District Superintendents, Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

B. Mandate that all schools develop diagnostic procedures for early identification of potential dropouts. Elementary schools should focus on grades K through 3, junior high schools on grade 7, middle schools on grade 6 and high schools on grade 9. Various data should be employed, including academic achievement records, attendance, physical and emotional profiles, and language skills.

Implementation: Fall, 1980.

Responsibility: Assistant Superintendent of Community District Affairs, Community District Superintendents and the Executive Director of High Schools; Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

C. Increase the number of potential and actual dropouts served in all schools, including alternative schools, by at least 25% through an expansion of effective dropout prevention and treatment programs.

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Same as in "B", above.

D. Pilot projects of organizing large high schools into smaller units, such as mini-schools or "houses" will be developed.

Implementation: Fall 1981

Responsibility: Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

E. Curriculum revision to address the needs of the potential and actual dropout.

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Executive Director of Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Assistant Superintendent for Community District Affairs, Community District Superintendents and the Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

F. Open an Evening Vocational High School based on the demand for vocational and technical services and evaluate its efficiency for reducing the dropout rate.

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Executive Director of High Schools, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

III. Outreach to Dropouts

Purpose: Contact dropouts; diagnose their academic, emotional and physical problems; and place them in appropriate programs. Develop Outreach Centers under the Bureau of Attendance in each school district (community and high school) for outreach, diagnosis and placement.

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Bureau of Attendance with assistance from Director, Office of Funded Programs, the Executive Director of High Schools, Assistant Superintendent for Community District Superintendents, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Instruction.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Improve the equitable access of all students to high school programs which suit their interests and needs.

Purpose: Expand programs, revise high school admissions procedures and articulation with feeder schools.

A. Centralize and computerize High School Admissions

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Executive Director of High Schools.

B. Enhance the attractiveness of the local zoned school and increase the number of educational options which are geographically distributed.

Implementation: Spring 1980

Responsibility: Executive Director of High Schools

C. Replicate effective educational options in at least five high schools.

Implementation: Spring, 1980 and Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Executive Director of High Schools.

D. Pilot a curriculum in a subject area which targets potential dropouts and low achieving students and provide counseling for high school admissions in their last year of junior high school. Focus high school offerings and admissions procedures.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Community District Superintendents, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Executive Director of High Schools.

II. Dropout Information Management

Purpose: Assemble a precise and accurate data bank of dropout information for the entire school system on which plans and decisions can be based.

A. Publish an "Annual Dropout Report".

Implementation: September, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Bureau of Attendance.

B. Establish dropout program data bank, including kinds of programs, number of students served and evaluation.

Implementation: Fall, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Office of Educational Evaluation.

III. Funding

Purpose: Pursue reimbursable monies to fund dropout prevention and treatment programs.

A. Expand proposal writing activity in the area of dropout prevention and treatment programs.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Office of Funded Programs, the Executive Director of High Schools, Community District Superintendents, Senior Assistant to the Chancellor for Community District Affairs.

B. Conduct proposal writing workshops on dropout prevention and treatment for personnel of all levels of the school system.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Office of Funded Programs, Assistant Superintendent for Community District Affairs, Community District Superintendents, Executive Director of High Schools.

C. C.E.T.A. (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) monies should be directed increasingly to schools to help them serve potential and actual dropouts in the above mentioned programmatic recommendations.

Implementation: Spring, 1980

Responsibility: Director, Office of C.E.T.A. Administration, Executive Director of High Schools.

FOOTNOTES

[1]It is important to recognize that our dropout totals have taken account of out-migration. That is, we do not count out-migrants as dropouts. In recent years, the number of students entering New York City high schools from outside the City appears to have been approximately equal to the number of students who have moved out of the City.

[2]For example, programs of C.E.T.A. (the federal government's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) only accept applicants who pass eighth grade reading and math tests.

[3]The data in this table came from the following sources. The number of students entering ninth grade from public schools is from the June, 1974 Promotion Report of the Office of Educational Statistics. The estimated number of non-public school entrants is obtained from non-public school register data compiled by the Office of Educational Statistics. The estimate was obtained by subtracting the October 31, 1974, ninth grade register (20,648) from the October 31, 1979, grade register (32,944). These register totals exclude non-residents of New York City attending non-public schools within the city. For the purposes of this report, we have assumed that the entire loss to the non-public schools between grades 8 and 9 was attributable to net transfers to the public schools. Data were examined for the years 1972-1975 to ensure that the enrollment drop between grade 8 and 9 was approximately the same each year. Data on the numbers of graduates were obtained from the Reports on Graudates of the Division of High Schools. These reports are produced twice a year. We included all graduates in June, 1978 and January, 1979 except recipients of CRMD certificates (totaling 315) and students from Auxiliary Services receiving High School Equivalency Certificates (718). The first group were excluded because we did not include special education students in our promotion totals; the second group were excluded because students drop out of regular or alternative high schools prior to enrollment in Auxiliary Services, and therefore are already included in our deductions.

[4]The Bureau of Attendance compiles data by grade, of students admitted from outside New York City, and of those discharged to schools outside New York City. In 1975-1976 there were 10,581 admissions in grades 9-12 from schools outside New York City, and 11,616 discharges to schools outside the city. In 1977-1978, there were 10,304 admissions and 9,742 discharges. The 1976-1977 data are not available. All these numbers are subject to reporting error. No data are available on holdovers in high school; however, grade registers are quite stable from year to year, and they would not be if holdover rates were highly variable.

[5]A report by Advocates for Children presents a considerably higher estimate (53.4%) of the percentage of dropouts from the Class of 1978. Advocates for Children calculates the number of dropouts by subtracting the number of graduates from ninth grade enrollment four years earlier. This method is similar to our first method, except that they use ninth grade register data instead of promotion data. But ninth grade registers are much larger than the number of students in any one class, because many students remain in ninth grade for two or more years. We think that the number of students who enter ninth grade in any one year is a more appropriate baseline from which to measure dropout rates.

[6]This calculation demonstrates that a class that loses 14.4% of its students each year will lose 46.3% in four years: after one year, a class with N students and a dropout rate of 14.4% will have (0.856) x N students remaining; after two years, (0.856) x (0.856) x N students remain; after four years, (0.856) x (0.856) x (0.856) x (0.856) x N students remain. $(0.856)^4 = 0.537$. Thus, after four years, 53.7% of the students will not have dropped out; the remainder 46.3% will have dropped out.

[7]Project Catch -- Career Training Choice. Follow-up studies of students denied admission to the Vocational High School 1976-1977.

[8]Evaluation Study of Renewal Program, Economic Development Council 1977

[9]The Rheedlen Program is a non-profit educational organization which serves chronic truants between the ages of 10 to 12. It provides counseling to the children and their parents. In 1978

there were 163 children in the program and 60 volunteer counselors. Of those cases where children were non-attenders 80% began to attend school on a regular basis. The DOME Project is more limited. It is located in District 3 and jointly funded by the assistance of district personnel and VISTA volunteers.

[10]One unit per term is equal to $10,500. The total allocation to high schools for the Outreach Program in the Fall term, 1979, is 37.63 units or $395,115 (or an estimated $ 790,230 for the year).

APPENDIX A

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROPOUTS

IN THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

As reported by the Community School Districts to the
Office of Community School District Affairs

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How Many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
1	Youth Leadership Program - Staff in each school - 2 staff workers both Spanish speaking, work on social aspect, conduct meetings in schools, conduct group workshops and go into the homes of students for counselling of parents.	14 Elementary 4 Junior High	11,000
	Affiliated with Beth Israel Hospital teen-age services with an ALATEN Program to prevent alchohol drinking because of parent addiction.	1 Junior High	1,000
	Mini-school, small adademic program for Drop-Outs because of school failure.	2 Junior High	60
	Experimental School - part of mini-school program.		44
	Third Street Music School and Elliot Feld Ballet - both come to schools to instruct students in music and ballet they offer scholarships to all students.		50 50
2	Positive Alternative Program - after school program, tutoring, rap sessions, trips, sports, arts and crafts.	7 Elementary 7 JH/IS	300
	Alternative School Program - all day program - working with teachers to help maintain and succeed with program of counseling (1 to 1), arts and crafts academic classes (try to keep in main-stream where possible), sports.	1 Elementary 2 JH/IS	50
	Out Reach Program - students seen only once for screening, rap sessions to get students interested.	10 Elementary 5 JH/IS	2,000
3	Rheedien Program and Dome Program - These are privately funded programs with some funds from the district. Identifies and works with potential drop-outs. One-to-one and small groups, works in the school and at selected program sites, psychologist, social workers, attendance teachers, full recreational facilities, homework assistance, tutorial help, parental involvement (workers contact parents after school by telephone and visits), close principal and guidance counselor contacts.	All Elementary and J.H.S.	200

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How Many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
	Attendance Teachers (district assigned) visit homes and work on an individual basis.	All 23 district schools	400
4	District has established a separate school organization funded through PSEN-BETA School (Better Education Through Alternatives). Students are referred through a combination of attendance and behavioral problems. Reduced class size and attention to special needs are stressed in an attempt to prepare students for re-entry into normal tract classes.	1 Elementary	180
	SCANT (Progam School Community Action for a New Tomorrow)	4 JH/IS	3,500
	SPORT School - 7 & 8 grades All programs have individual and group counseling, parental involvement (parents must attend counseling for students to be accepted in any program), after school activities, remedial academic classes and sports.	1 Junior High	170
5	In-School Prevention Program - "Project Decision" - individual group counseling (alcohol and substance abuse).	21 Schools	3,481 Elementary 4,008 JH/IS
6	Project 6 - rap ressions, individual and group counseling	JH/IS	60
	Project Success (Title I) - mostly academic help in small groups.	Elementary & JH	100
7	Career Resource Center - computer work, arts and crafts to be housed at I.S. school.	1 Intermediate	250
	Creative Arts Alternative Program - I.S. 139.		
	Drug Abuse - rap sessions, counseling (1 to 1) and group counseing.	15 Elementary	
	Adult Program - to select drop-outs from districts (16 years and older)	14 Elementary 7 JH/IS	3,500
	Roberto Clemente High School Program	15 Elementary	
8	ADAPT Program - 1 to 1 counseling and group counseling.	20 Elementary 8 JH/IS	25,000-
	Peer Leadership - family counseling, positive alternatives, home visits and referrals.		

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How Many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
9	Alternative Educational Centers (2) Youthful Drug Abuse Program Individual and group counseling, rap sessions, academic help.	8 JH/IS	900
10	Alternate School Program - small pupil/ teacher ratio, individualized program self contained classrooms can be clustered between 2 and 3 classrooms, group remains together in cluster Alternate Learning School: 6 sites 4 JH/IS 1 Alternate Learning School - off site location. 1 Interim class, 2 classrooms in District Office, small groups, never more than 10 students.	6 JH/IS	520
11	Pre-kindergarten screening identifies potential drop-outs - prevention and diagnostic program for teachers to learn to recognize pupils with learning problems Drug WOMACS - reduce pupil potential for drug involvement, improve attitudes toward school and academic achievement Preventive Interventive District 11 - Alchohol and Substance Abuse Preventive Program Project Interim - an intervention program rap session, clinical services, BCG, Russo Clinic, Jacobi Hospital, Bronx	3 Elementary 3 Non-Public 8 IS/JH 2 Elementary 23 Elementary	300 500 385 60
12	Alternatives to Suspension - after school tutorial/counseling on a 1 to 1 basis, minimum 10-15 pupils District has an alternative school (middle school) for approximately 90 students Outreach Program - provides counseling on a part time basis to pupils in district schools who have been identified as potential problems. 12 Senior School Neighborhood Workers (10 servicing the schools - 2 in District Office).	7 JH/IS 19 Elementary 7 JH/IS	250 90 250

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How Many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
13	Positive Direction (Funded by Drug program) to work with schools in an effort to prevent drop-outs.	4 Junior Highs	800
15	Transitional Classes - 22 classes	12 Elementary	378
	Family Reception Center - referrals from school counselors to the center where supportive services are given during the school day.	1 Elementary 1 Junior High	90
	Drug Education Program - individual assistance, 1 to 1 counseling Group assistance - small group counseling	5 Junior High	300
	Family Counseling - Parents only or with children - 100 families	5 Junior High	400
	Elementary School Component - prevention in use of drugs, teacher training, classroom instruction	11 Elementary	150
16	Community Counseling Service Program 4 components: 1 Alternative classes 2 Prevention 3 Intervention 4 Special Activities	3 Junior High	2,120
	Bedford Stuyvesant Mental Health Center		1,000
	Workshop - trips to Albany, Washington D.C. Mini Law Services-take students to courts		300 per year

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i. e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-Out Prevention Programs
14	Drug Program - program is a prevention and intervention program with 1 to 1 and group counseling	20 Elementary 6 JH/IS	10,000
	Attendance Program - program is a prevention and intervention program with small group counseling	20 Elementary 6 JH/IS	20,000
24	District 24 has 22 learning disabilities resource rooms, 14 transitional classes, 18 ESAA reading centers, guidance counsel pupils, small group reading classes	19 Elementary 5 JH/IS	3,000
	Alcohol and Drug Abuse - 1 to 1 counseling, group counseling, rap sessions, parental involvement.	19 Elementary 5 JH/IS	5,000

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
17	RAP Cycle - individual and group counseling	15 Elementary/ 5 JH/IS	20,000
	Drug Prevention Workshop - parents, teachers and community, program is more preventive than interventive humanistic education, students go on trips to Washington D.C., cultural affairs, staff of 13 for intervention instruction and addiction instruction go into all 20 schools	15 Elementary/ 5 JH/IS	6,000
18	Project Turn Around Special attention given, group meetings held, individual counseling, talks about positive alternatives	5 J.H.S.	15 in each school
	Prevention Suspension Program - geared to pupils who might possibly be suspended Teacher-Parent Workshops held	6 schools	
	Drug Program - Project Concern Pupils recommended by principal and teacher for counseling	3 schools	12 in each class
19	31 Guidance Counselors	20 Elementary 12 J.H.S.	
	Career Guidance Program Identify and inculcate basic skills	J.H.S 166 I.S. 218	90. 110
	Drug Program - Reach Out - deals with alcohol and substance abuse, identification of youngsters who evidence poor attendance, atypical behavior problems, self referral, teacher or guidance counselor referral	14 schools	2,000
	All Attendance Teachers assigned to specific schools who work with truants displaying erratic attendance behavior	27 schools	
	In the process of establishing a prep school that will admit youngsters who are potential drop-outs based on referrals from guidance counselor, principal. This is a bridge program for students going from J.H.S. into H.S. who would probably drop out after J.H.S.		13 students to or teacher

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i. e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-Out Prevention Programs
20	Drug Prevention Program - Individual and group counseling affective type program	6 JH/IS 22 Elementary	11,500
21	Direction 21 - program part of Dist. 75	6 JH/IS	30
	Greenhouse, Arts and Music Drug Prevention Academic in-school program for under achievers, reduced classes	29 grades 4-9 1 Junior High	12,000 75
22	Drug Abuse Prevention Program Alternative School - I. S. 14 & J. H. 278 plus regular program	5 Junior Highs & selected Elementary	300
23	Individual Counseling Service - to selected students on a 1 to 1 basis, group services same students with a means to change behavior.	4 JH/IS	210
	Alternative School to change attitude of student who cannot function in regular school and are truant or have dropped out. Alternative Schools provide academic instruction and counseling services.	4 JH/IS	210
25	Project 25 - rap sessions, group and 1 to 1 counseling	22 Elementary 7 JH/IS	1,000 1,200
	Attendance Bureau out in field to check all absentees		
	Alternate School - individual group and family counseling, academic program, career exploration program	7, 8, 9, grades	100

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i.e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-out Prevention Programs
27	Tax-Levy Alternative Program	6 JH/IS	500
	After school recreational program - pools used at Far Rockaway H.S., John Adams H.S., Richmond Hill H.S.	26 Elementary 4 JH/IS	500-600
	Drug Abuse - all schools and students indentified according to needs	26 Elementary 4 JH/IS	30

STATUS REPORT REGARDING IDENTIFYING AND SERVING POTENTIAL DROP-OUTS

District	Type of service (i. e. program) list & describe programs according to specific purpose	How many schools involved	Number of students involved in Drop-Out Prevention Programs
30	Proposed attendance plan for District 30 - to stress and implement programs to improve attendance and reduce the potential drop-outs monthly contest awards - semi and annual, educational program to involve parents, program to involve various community agencies, attendance staff available to address parent and school groups, early identification of potential drop-outs through their past attendance records.	20 Elementary 5 JH/IS	22,000
	Alcohol and Substance Education and Prevention Program - activities are designed to bring about positive attitudinal changes by involving students in developing copying mechanism, learning to communicate, make friends and developing individual values, 1 to 1 counseling and small group counseling	9 Elementary & selected N.P.S. 5 JH/IS	1,190 1,550

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

STEPHEN R. AIELLO, PRESIDENT

JOSEPH G. BARKAN, VICE PRESIDENT

AMELIA ASHE

ROBERT J. CHRISTEN

MARJORIE A. LEWIS

MIGUEL O. MARTINEZ

JAMES F. REGAN

FRANK J. MACCHIAROLA, CHANCELLOR

RICHARD F. HALVERSON, DEPUTY CHANCELLOR